

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
NORTHERN DIVISION

MICHAEL RODRIGUEZ-ARANGO,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNKNOWN SNYDER,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:23-cv-125

HON. JANE M. BECKERING

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**OPINION AND ORDER**

This is a prisoner civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. The matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge, who issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R), recommending that this Court grant the motion and dismiss this case. The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation, to which Defendant filed a response. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3), the Court has performed de novo consideration of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made. The Court denies the objections and issues this Opinion and Order.

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant strip searched him because of his sexual orientation in violation of the Equal Protection Clause, and, in support of his claim, he alleges that two other prisoners were not strip searched. The Magistrate Judge concluded that Defendant established that no genuine issue of material fact exists with respect to Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment equal protection claim (R&R, ECF No. 22 at PageID.158). In pertinent part, the Magistrate Judge

pointed out that Defendant presented evidence that the strip search was required by prison policy and rules (*id.* at PageID.155, 157).

In his objections, Plaintiff briefly indicates his disagreement with the resolution of his case (Pl. Obj., ECF No. 23 at PageID.162–163). And he attaches his own affidavit wherein he restates his factual claims (ECF No. 24).

Plaintiff's objections are properly denied. The Magistrate Judge expressly took Plaintiff's allegations at face value. *See* R&R, ECF No. 22 at PageID.154–155. And Plaintiff does not identify any legal error in the Magistrate Judge's analysis. Accordingly, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation as the Opinion of this Court. A Judgment will be entered consistent with this Opinion and Order. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 58. Because this action was filed *in forma pauperis*, this Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith. *See McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 610 (6th Cir. 1997), overruled on other grounds by *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 206, 211–12 (2007). Therefore:

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Objections (ECF No. 23) are DENIED and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 22) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 18) is GRANTED.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith.

Dated: April 30, 2025

/s/ Jane M. Beckering  
JANE M. BECKERING  
United States District Judge